



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ART. XI.—*On the Date and Personality of Priyadarsi.* By
R. G. LATHAM, M.D.

[*Read 3rd December, 1859.*]

THE present paper will fall into two divisions; the first of which deals with the name and date of Priyadarsi as they appear in the Edicts, whilst the second will take notice of the doctrines introduced *ab extra*; by which is meant the hypotheses connected with the names Asoka and Chandragupta. The reasons for this separation are cogent. In the first place the degrees of confidence with which the author expresses himself are different. In the one series of questions he is, to a great extent (though not altogether) in the position of the biblical historian, who, although he be ignorant of Greek and Hebrew, has, nevertheless, a sufficient store of facts in the standard translation of the Old and New Testaments to put him, for nine points out of ten, on an approximate level with the professed scholar. The Edicts themselves are not only accessible to the general reader through the translations of Prinsep and Wilson, but the *data* that bear immediately and decidedly upon them are accessible also. So far as they lie in the coinage of the Baetrian Kings they are to be found in the pages of the *Ariana Antiqua* and the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*. So far as they lie in the texts of the classical writers they are simply so much Latin and Greek. It cannot be said that very much requiring special learning in either the Sanskrit or the Pali presents itself during this stage of our inquiries. When, however, Priyadarsi gets identified with Asoka and affiliated to Chandragupta, all this comparative independence of the special lore of India vanishes. The writer, who cannot go into first-hand inquiries must take his facts as men more learned than himself think proper to give them. He can criticise their logic; he can see whether the evidence that they bring forward sanctions their results; but he can never be sure, except on their own admission, that the evidence, when insufficient, has been exhausted, and that better reasons than any he has seen may not be lying in the background.

For the edicts, however, and the texts which immediately and decidedly bear upon them there is, at least, an approximation to something like equality between the laity, or general students, and the

high priests, or special scholars. The *whole* of the materials are accessible to the world at large; or (if not the whole) an adequate proportion of them.

In the second place, this separation of the material elements from the accessories is imperatively called for by the nature of the questions to which they apply. Nothing is more injurious than the habit of putting inferences, however satisfactory, on a level with the primary historical facts to which they attach themselves. First comes one deduction; which, in the eyes of its author, is perfectly unexceptionable. Another follows—unexceptionable also. And then, another; and another still. And then a system; until the primary fact, lost and overlaid by its adjuncts and encumbrances, becomes the least part of itself. When this is the case, it sometimes happens that a new application of it is demanded; so that it may require to be seen under a different light, and from a fresh point of view. It is now, however, difficult to isolate it; difficult so (as the Germans say) to purify our idea of it. It presents itself to us with a certain number of its associated doctrines adhering to it, and requires an effort to be seen rightly.

The notion of what we may call the *puro* and *simple* Priyadarsi of the pure and simple text of the Edicts, without subtraction and without addition, with the recognition, too, of a broad distinction between what the text *allows* and what it *demands* has yet to be exhibited.

Now what does the text of the Edicts *require*? Taken by itself it requires him to have reigned twelve years—possibly and probably more—but certainly not less. Does it require him to have been a contemporary of Antiochus? Yes. Does it require him to have been a King? Yes. Does it require him to have been a King in India? Yes. Does it require him to have been an Indian King; by which I mean a native ruler? No. It allows him to have been one. It does more. It supplies strong presumptions in favour of his having been one; but it in no wise binds us to look for him in India and nowhere else.

We look, however, towards India first. And what do we look for? The *name*—the name, if not *literatim*, at least, *verbatim*. Word for word, we want **PRIYADARSI**. We don't want its synonym. We don't want a translation of it. We want the word itself. In India, however, we find but one name at all—and that is that of *Sophagosenus*, a King placed, by Antiochus the Great, over either a part of India itself, or on the Indian frontier. Place for place and time for time, this is not unsuitable—but, on the contrary, very square

and fit. Word for word, however, the names are too unlike for even the boldest manipulator of letter-changes to identify.

Failing in India we look elsewhere. We are bound to seek, though not to find. Bactria gives us nothing more promising than the following :—*Theodotus*, *Euthydemus*, *Demetrius*, *Eukratides*, and *Heliodorus*.

Failing in Bactria we look to Parthia; and in Parthia (if the present paper be true) we both seek and find. Word for word, I believe that **PRIYADARSI** is **PHRAATES**.

Such the doctrine, which must be considered in respect to

- 1st. The form of words;
- 2nd. The conditions of place; and
- 3rd. The conditions of time.

Phraates = *Priyadarsi*.—Little need be said in favour of the Kapur di Giri form *Priyadarsi*, being a nearer approach to the real name than the *Piyadasi* of the Dhauli, Girnar, and Cuttak monuments. The *r* is, all the world over, and in India most especially, more easily omitted where it has previously existed, than inserted where it was originally absent. Little, too, need be said about the Persian forms being varied, viz., *Phraortes*, *Phrahates*, and *Phraates*. Neither need we enlarge upon the fact of the word as we have it in the Greek and Latin writers being itself a secondary form. The real name by which certain Kings of Parthia were called by themselves and their subjects, was, in all probability, as far removed from *Phraates* on one side as from *Priyadarsi* on the other. At the same time it is by no means impossible that the Indian form was taken directly from the Greek.

It is not, however, necessary to multiply preliminaries upon this point; for, fortunately, the circumstance of an Indian rendering of the name *Phraates* saves us some trouble. On the reverse of one of the coins of the Ariana—one of *Gundophares* or *Undophares*—the name actually occurs, and that as *Pharahatasa*. It is admitted that this is but an approximation to the form required by our hypothesis; whilst, at the same time, it must be remembered that the conditions in the way of time and place, of the *Pharahatasa* coins, though very similar to those of the *Priyadarsi* Edicts, are not exactly identical. The latitude, however, that may be allowed in our identification is conveniently, though roughly, determined by comparing the Greek names of the Bactrian Kings with the Indian equivalents; in

other words, by copying a certain number of legends from the Ariana Antiqua.

Thus

The Greek <i>Heliokles</i>	is in Indian <i>Heliyaklaya</i>
„ <i>Lysias</i>	<i>Lisiasa</i>
„ „	<i>Lisikasa</i>
„ <i>Amyntas</i>	<i>Amitasa</i>
„ <i>Antimachus</i>	<i>Atimakhasa</i>
„ <i>Philoxenus</i>	<i>Pilashinasa</i>
„ <i>Antialkides</i>	<i>Antialikitasa</i>
„ „	<i>Atialikitasa</i>
„ <i>Archebius</i>	<i>Akhabiyasa</i>
„ <i>Menander</i>	<i>Minandasa</i>
„ „	<i>Minadasa</i>
„ <i>Apollodotus</i>	<i>Apaladatasa</i>
„ <i>Diomedes</i>	<i>Tayamidasa</i>
„ <i>Hermæus</i>	<i>Ermyasa</i>
„ <i>Agathocles</i>	<i>Agathakalyaja</i>
„ <i>Pantaleon</i>	<i>Patalavata</i>
„ <i>Mayes</i>	<i>Maasa</i>
„ <i>Abagetus</i>	<i>Abakhafasasa</i>

Of these forms the ones that most command attention are *Pilashinasa* and *Tayamidasa*. The former as compared with *Philoxenus* gives us the *r* for the *rh*; the latter gives the *y* between the vowels, and the termination *as*, instead of *es*. The insertion of *y* is also given in *Heliyaklaya*.

Place.—I pass over this *sicco pede*; presuming that if the conditions which next come under notice—those of time prove valid, the question of place may be left to take care of itself.

Date.—This is of primary importance. According to Heron the twelfth year of Phraates I., King of Parthia, was B.C. 169. Now this is *not* the year that gives us the simplest results. To say nothing about the complications engendered by the names rendered Magas, Antigonus, and Alexander, of which notice will be taken hereafter, B.C. 169 is not the year wherein the ordinary interpretation of the ordinary texts places the chief Parthian invasions of India. It is not the year for which they give us even inroads upon the frontier. It is not within twenty years either way of any such recorded inroads—not, at least, according to the ordinary interpretation of the ordinary texts. It is either too early or too late; as we may see by taking a survey of

the history of Eastern Persia for the times anterior and subsequent to it. If so, King Phraates gives the very worst word we could have chosen. He has a suitable name and nothing else. If he is remarkable for anything at all, he is remarkable for coming between two periods, in each of which there were Parthian attacks upon India—himself being agent in neither.

Thus, between B.C. 216 and B.C. 196, we have the reign of Artabanus I ; and this, as far as everything but the name goes, gives us all we want. It gives us an Antiochus with whom it is imperative that Priyadarsi should be contemporary—Antiochus the Great. It also gives us a Ptolemy, similarly demanded by the text of the Edicts—Ptolemy Philopater. But it gives us no name better than Artabanus. Meanwhile Euthydemus is reigning over Bactria ; concerning whose relations with Syria and Parthia we have the following account. Artabanus, the third King of his line, has to defend Media against Antiochus ; which he does with sufficient effect for hostilities to end in a compact ; one of the conditions of which was that Bactria should be attacked by the conjoint armies—Bactria under the rule of Euthydemus. But this invasion also ends in another compact, in virtue of which Demetrius, son of Euthydemus, is commissioned to make conquests in India. They are made ; and ceded to Sophagases, a native chief. A fair amount of detail is known concerning this campaign which, though, in the main, Syrian, Bactrian, and Indian, is Parthian so far as the alliance between Artabanus and Antiochus is concerned.

From B.C. 196 to B.C. 181 Priapatius, the only King of his name, reigns over Parthia. Of him we know the name only. He is succeeded by the object of the present notice.

Phraates I, having reigned from B.C. 181 to B.C. 144, is simply said by Heeren to have conquered the Mardians on the Caspian. This is little enough for a reign of 37 years ; and little as it is, it is anything but either Bactrian or Indian. Be it so. All we do at present is to note the long duration of his reign. His brother Mithridates I. succeeds him, and dying in B.C. 136, reigns eight years. Now Mithridates I. is pre-eminently the Parthian invader of India. He “ruises Parthia,” writes Heeren, “to rank among the mighty empires of the world.” He reduces Media, Persia, Babylonia, and extends the frontiers of his kingdom “westward to the Euphrates, and eastward to the Hydaspes.”

Truly, then, may we say that Phraates is either too early or too late for our purpose. Had Artabanus borne a manageable name it is probable that, when once reconciled to the idea that a tender-hearted

Buddhist could possibly be a bloody-minded Parthian, we might have identified him with Priyadarsi, on the strength of the extent to which the conditions of both time and place favoured his claim to the appellation. With Mithridates (had his name been practicable) I imagine that we should have found still less difficulty.

Now it is not unreasonable to suppose that, during the long reign of his predecessor, the Mithridates may have been an active lieutenant, and have done work as heir to the crown, the records of which bear the name of the ruling monarch. Other assumptions are tenable—not to say probable. We may assume, for instance, that Artabanus (the ally of Antiochus the Great) kept his hold on a certain portion of Bactria and transmitted his occupancy to his successor. Or we may assume that Phraates I. was a great conqueror, though an unrecorded one. The *minimum* amount, however, of hypothetical matter lies in the doctrine we find suggested. It is true, no doubt, that the conquests in India are always given to Mithridates I., *eo nomine*—to Mithridates the *King* of Parthia. We must remember, however, that the writers who notice them are either general historians, like Justin, or authors, like Polybius and Strabo, whose mention of the affairs of the far East are little more than *obiter dicta*. Polybius, no doubt, lived during the times of which he gives the history. In *place*, however, he was far removed from either India or the Indian frontier. Do we not even now speak of the Duke of Wellington's career in India—the Duke of Wellington, who, to improve the comparison with Mithridates, had a brother a Governor-General, in whose name, as in the name of Phraates, Edicts were framed and proclamations issued?

With the dates as we find them in Heeren's Manual of Ancient History the doctrine under notice is scarcely an assumption at all. With Heeren's dates it is almost a necessity. Heeren's giving Mithridates I., from B.C. 144 to B.C. 136, requires 139 and 140 (if not more) for the well known war against Demetrius II. of Syria; a war which was carried on at the extreme edge of the frontier most distant from India. This so breaks up his short reign of eight years (for only by so much does he survive his brother) that the operations in India requisite for the conquests attached to his name are (to say the least of them) extremely improbable.

Lest any one should think that the confusion between Mithridates the Crown Prince and Mithridates the King, is improbable, I have only to remark that it is to be found in the pages of Heeren himself. In his notice of Parthia, Phraates reigns from B.C. 181 to B.C. 144. In his notice of the Seleucidæ he writes that “while the Parthian King, Mithridates I., is prosecuting his conquests at the expense of the Syrian

Kingdom in Upper Asia, Demetrius secretly escapes out of Rome, takes possession of the throne, and causes Eupator and Lysias to be put to death." The date is B.C. 161. I have not gone into the examination of the authorities for this coincidence between the death of Eupator and the absence of Mithridates in India. It may rest upon the authority of a classical writer ; or it may merely be an example of the habit in which too many modern historians indulge of making things neat and square, by putting together events in way of cause and effect which may or may not have been so connected. It is clear, however, that, whichever way we view it, it favours, rather than opposes, our doctrine.

So much for the dates as they present themselves in Heeren's manual ; a work to which I refer simply because it is a convenient one. Much of what lies in the present paper consists in the inferences deducible from certain coincidences of date, and in order to show the extent to which they are undesigned, I take the numbers as I find them in the ordinary works. This ensures them against being adapted to any preconceived system. Now the dates of Heeren are not the dates of the *Ariana Antiqua*. The differences, however, touch the date of the *death* of Mithridates, rather than that of his accession to the throne. Now the earliest period for the *end* of his reign is B.C. 140—a period which creates no difficulties in the question in hand. In respect to his accession the date of B.C. 181, suggested by Bayer, is exactly the date assigned by Heeren to Phraates I. For his conquests in India, Raoul Rochette suggests B.C. 155 ; Bayer B.C. 147.

Antiochus the Great dies B.C. 164. Eukratides begins to reign about B.C. 181, and reigns long. He is evidently a powerful Prince. Without ignoring the argument that the Mithridatic conquests were more likely to have taken place after the death of Antiochus than before it, and that a powerful prince like Eukratides is not exactly the likeliest man to allow of Parthian conquests in India, I am not prepared to overvalue it. Powerful kings have found it politic to part with portions of their territory ; and, both before and after B.C. 169, alliances like those between Syria under Antiochus, and Bactria under Euthydeus and Eukratides, have been abandoned. At any rate the likelihood of Mithridates having invaded Bactria (though not India) is expressly admitted in the *Ariana Antiqua*—"although we cannot admit that Mithridates invaded India during the reign of Eukratides, yet there is little reason to doubt that, under him, the provinces contiguous to Parthia on the east and north-east, Asia, parts of Drangiana and Arachosia, Margiana and part of Bactria

proper, were annexed to the Parthian Kingdom." Again—"there is positive testimony, and it is consistent with probability that the Parthians dismembered Bactria and detached from it two of its satrapies, even in the reign of Eukratides. It is not specified under what Parthian King; but it may have been under Mithridates." This is all that the present doctrine requires. It merely requires that the dismemberment in question should have been effected by Mithridates as Crown Prince rather than by Mithridates as King.

The names of the two conquered satrapies now command our attention, viz., *Aspiōnus* and *Turiua*. Such, at least they seem to be. In the text of Strabo (xi. ii. 3) the former appears in the genitive case, 'Ασπιονόν; the latter in the accusative, Τούριον—where it is apparently an adjective agreeing with Σατράπιαν. Now whether we agree or disagree with Mr. Court in identifying these words with the present *Uzbin* and *Tūri* (*Oozbin* and *Toori*) the names of two divisions of the Ghilzye branch of Afghans, (the former to the south of the Kabul river, the latter to the north, both on the upper third of it), we still find the names *Aspii* and *Thyraei* between the Nijrow and the Kuner—names which make it highly probable that the Kapur di Giri inscription stood not only in the Parthian portion of Bactria, but in one of the two satrapies which are specially, and by name, stated to have constituted the detached districts.

So much for the Priyadarsi of the Edicts; or rather of the Priyadarsi of the Kapur di Giri inscription; for it is clear that, admitting the probability of three of the inscriptions having been copies of a single prototype—copies neither necessarily of the same date nor necessarily of different ones—it is in the monument nearest to the Parthian frontier that we most reasonably seek the original. So much, then, for the Priyadarsi of the Kapur di Giri record.

The Priyadarsi of the Lats now comes under notice. He must have advanced beyond the Indus. He must hold not merely that animal life should not be unnecessarily wasted, but he must hold it on grounds that approach the doctrines of Buddhism. Finally, he must have reigned six-and-twenty years—perhaps more; certainly not less. This is because the Kapur di Giri Edicts are promulgated in the twelfth year of his reign; those of the Lats in the twenty-seventh.

Now Phraates the First is not only the only King with a practicable name who was a cotemporary of any monarch named Antiochus, but he is the only such cotemporary who reigned so long as twenty-six years and upwards.

Lastly comes the Priyadarsi of the Bairath inscription. The

Priyadarsi here must be, if not an actual Buddhist, something very like one—something (as must be admitted) a great deal too like for anything corresponding to the ordinary idea of a Parthian.

This contains the germ of an objection. There are, of course, others. In respect to these, I by no means hold it sufficient to show that they are not inseverable. It is better to find them non-existent, than to explain them away, however plausibly. That they can be explained away, I believe; and, believing this, maintain that, whilst they are admitted, they must also be valued. In other words, the improbabilities which they involve must be weighed against the improbabilities of the opposite view. Thus—

In respect to the name, I have remembered that the term *Priyadarsi* is significant in the Indian language; and I have by no means undervalued this fact, as evidence to its bearer having been an Indian. But I have also remembered that *Aornos* is significant in Greek, and that *asparagus*, when converted by a not uncommon catachresis into *sparrow-grass*, makes very good English. Still, Priyadarsi is significant in Sanskrit. *Valeat quantum.*

Again, the Antiochus of whom Priyadarsi was the cotemporary was the cotemporary of a Ptolemy. There is no difficulty here. All the Antiochi had Ptolemy for cotemporaries.

He was also the cotemporary of an Antigonus and an Alexander. Who these were is uncertain. All that can be said is that they are just as likely to have lived in the times of Antiochus Epiphanes as any other bearer of the name.

With Magas, a fourth cotemporary of Priyadarsi, the case is different. The date B.C. 169 leaves the name Magas unexplained. But this is not all. An earlier one explains it. An earlier one gives us Magas a King of Cyrene. A ruler of that name was actually cotemporary with Antiochus the Great. No ruler of that name is known to have been cotemporary with Antiochus Epiphanes—the cotemporary of Phraates I. There may, of course have been such an individual; just as there may have been Antigoni and Alexanders. The absence, however, of the name must be admitted as an exception to our hypothesis. *Valeat quantum.*

Upon the whole however, the coincidences of the date and place of the inscription, with that of the form of the names, satisfy me that the hypothesis under consideration is legitimate—at least in the eyes of those who (like myself) never, except when all other means have been exhausted, refer coincidences to accident.

Having eliminated accident let us see what the hypothesis explains—what it explains when dealing with the monument as one of

Phraates I., pure and simple ; and what as one of Phraates I., a King of Parthia, with Buddhist elements in his creed.

Limited to Phraates I., pure and simple, it accounts for the Arianian character of the Kapur di Giri alphabet ; and it does so in a very remarkable and interesting manner. The date assigned of the accession of Eukratides, viz., B.C. 181, is the exact year assigned by Heeren for the accession of Phraates. Now the coins of Eukratides are well known to be the first on which we find an inscription in Arianian letters ; a coincidence which gives to the first legends of the coins on the parts about Jellalabad the same date, to a King's reign, with the first inscription in the same alphabet, for the same district. Of Phraates I., as a Buddhist, in the full and proper sense of the term, as a Buddhist like the present King of Siam or the Grand Lama of Thibet, there can, of course, be no question whatever. The most that can be said of such Buddhism as a King of Parthia in the second century B.C., could maintain, is that it was something out of which a more developed creed could be evolved, or something differentiated from both Brahminism and Zoroastrianism by certain Buddhist elements. Viewed in this light, and the Parthians being held to be Turanian, the facts connected with the names Sakya, Seythianus, and (perhaps) Budh itself, are accounted for.

So is the apparent abeyance of the Zoroastrian religion between the times of the Achaemenidæ and Sassanians.

So is (in some degree) the final ejection of the Buddhist creed from India ; a creed foreign to the soil, and obnoxious to the reaction of Brahminism.

The more of anything the present hypothesis will explain, the more it will gain in strength. It may, also, gain in strength on other grounds. Any evidence to the existence of a second Magas ; anything definite concerning Antigonus or Alexander ; anything shewing that the Kapur di Giri inscription was older than the other three, would improve it. On the other hand the converse of the latter would detract from it. Evidence that Phraates I. reigned less than twenty-seven years would be fatal. Putting all this together we see that the doctrine under notice is provisional.

And now the first part of my inquiries approaches its termination ; the result being that, word for word Priyadarsi is Phraates, and that in the twelfth year of the reign of Phraates I., there was a Parthian occupancy of the parts about Jellalabad, and in the twenty-seventh year of the same reign a similar occupancy of the districts near Allahabad and elsewhere. The grounds for the conjectural portion of the hypothesis are *historical* ; and they are characterised by being so.

Though the conjecture itself may be wrong, its grounds are historical. The grounds on which the speculations upon what may be called the accessories of the question are based—are traditional, constructive, and what not? For this reason I lay little stress upon the bearing of them either one way or the other; I merely point out certain coincidences, some close, some only approximate; coincidences from which it may be seen that the accessory facts in the history of the opinions concerning Priyadarsi are, at least, as much in favour of the present doctrine as against it.

In the first place, a conquest of Ceylon, concurrent with the dismemberment of Bactria, is indicated in the Priyadarsi inscriptions; where *Tambapanni* (*Taprobane*) specially occurs, as the name of a portion of Priyadarsi's empire. Whether such a conquest must necessarily have been effected by an Indian King rather than by a Parthian (considering the extent of sea-board belonging to the latter) is a question for the reader to consider.

Secondly. The "Ceylonese possess a trustworthy and intelligible chronology beginning with the year 161 B.C." Upon the principle of taking other men's dates, rather than being tempted to tamper with them by making them for myself, I give the preceding statement in the words of Professor Müller; who endorses the view of Turnour. If I agreed with these two scholars I should only do so because their statements favoured my hypothesis: so that (practically speaking) I doubt the fact. The date, however, is remarkable. It lies, as near as may be, half-way between that of the Kapur di Giri monument and the Lats. If the Ceylonese have really a true chronology from the time under notice, a conquest by a King of Parthia is, certainly, a satisfactory way of accounting for it.

Devānāmpriya Tisha, writes Dr. Müller, was a King of Ceylon who made Buddhism the state religion of the island. Surely, word for word, *Devānāmpriya Tisha* is *Devānāmpriyo Priyadarsi*, the King Priyadarsi, Beloved of the Gods of the Priyadarsic Edicts. It requires no skill in the higher branches of emendatory and conjectural criticism to see this. A printer's reader, a printer's compositor, can tell us that if we wish to ensure a clerical error or a misprint, we have only to let one word end with the same letters with which another begins.

Devānāmpriya Tisha "reigned forty years." The numbers are again from Dr. Müller. This is, within three years, the length of the reign of Phraates I. Meanwhile, observe the letter *t*, by which the *d* in Priyadarsi is replaced, and in which we get a sound which brings us one degree nearer to *Phraates*.

Devānāmpriya Tishya was the cotemporary of Asoka, and Asoka, like Devānāmpriya Tishya, was a promulgator of Buddhism. So writes Dr. Müller. But surely Devānāmpriya Tisha was Asoka as far, at least, as anything in *rerum naturā* (especially Priyadarsi) was Asoka.

That Priyadarsi is specially stated in the *Mahawanso* to be one and the same with Asoka, has long been known; the worth of the statement being unknown. Admit it to be true, and the hypothesis which (word for word) identifies *Priyadarsi* with *Phraates*, identifies (word for word) *Asoka* with *Arsaces*. Instead of "word for word," I might almost say "letter for letter." The omission of *r* is what we expect in the Pali. That the *s* is non-radical is shown by both the Armenian *Arshag*, and the Greek forms *Ἀρσάκην* and *Ἀρσάκιδην*. It is only the vowel *o* which creates a difficulty.

And now I must remark (though the notice is, perhaps, superfluous) that two identifications like the ones in question prove much more than twice as much as each would prove singly; in other words if the chances are (say) two to one against the similarity of sound between *Phraates* and *Priyadarsi*, and (say) the same against that of *Arsakes* and *Asoka* being accidental, the chances against the associate names *Asoka Priyadarsi* being *Arsakes Phraates* are more than four to one.

How long, however, did Asoka reign? According to one account twenty-six, to another thirty-seven years—the numbers being from Professor Wilson, writing of the northern Buddhists. Now thirty-seven is the exact number given, by Heeren, to *Phraates I*. From this subtract twelve, and the remainder gives (within a single year) the time between his Edicts and his death.

The identification of Asoka with Arsakes, and Priyadarsi with Phraates accounts for the double names—quite as well, at least, as they are accounted for by the Buddhist incarnations. The Arsakidæ were as individuals, so many *Artabani*, *Phraates*, *Tiridates*, *Mithridates*, or the like. As one of the Arsakidæ, however, each was an *Arsaces*.

It accounts for the multiplicity of Asokas. However, much a ruler was an *Artabanus*, a *Phraates*, a *Tiridates*, or a *Mithridates*, he was always an *Arsaces*.

But Asoka was the grandson of Chandragupta who was Sandracottus. Be it so. Those who put this on a level with the synchronisms of the Edicts, and believing in it as a real piece of history, believe also that Priyadarsi was an Indian Prince, are scarcely allowed to interpret the word *grandson* otherwise than strictly. Doing this,

they are also justified in putting the date of Priyadarsi's reign a generation earlier, and making the Antiochus with whom he was cotemporary Antiochus the Great. But let him be a King belonging to a foreign dynasty; yet desirous of being incorporated with the royal line of the country upon which he has introduced himself, and this necessity vanishes, and *grandson* may merely mean *descendant*; the affiliation being fictitious. To this view the historical existence of Bindusara the son of Chandragupta, and the father of Asoka must be sacrificed--or, at least, the exact details of his parentage.

But what if the current details of the important Bindusara be true? In such a case, much of the support which the first part of this paper derives from the second would fall to the ground. At any rate, the doctrine that a Parthian Prince named Asoka was the author of the Priyadarsi Edicts would require resetting. At the present moment I don't pretend to look upon Bindusara as a reality. On the other hand, however, I have no certainty that the evidence of his having been one may not be improved. With this contingency in the background I take leave of the subject. The pure and simple Priyadarsi of the Edicts I hold to have been Phraates I., the evidence upon which this conjecture rests (no matter what be the merits or demerits of the conjecture itself) being both historical and accessible. Such being the case I speak with confidence as to the identification. Whether Asoka be the same I cannot say. The statements which make him so are not only other than historical, but (to a great extent) unknown to me and inaccessible. Out of these that lie before me I know none that is fatal to my hypothesis. On the contrary I can select several which are extremely favourable to it. But I have no warrant that this selection is adequate. There may be more in the background than I can press into my service. To conclude: the Persia of the Achaemenide, and the Persia of the Sassanide have (each) been carefully studied in respect to their relations to India. In the present paper attention is drawn to the intermediate dynasty of the Arsacide. The question, too, as to the religion of the Parthians is suggested.